

a profile clamp (4,29, 46, 53) connecting the casing parts (2,3,23,24, 45, 56) shape matching against the force of an explosion like internal pressure of the casing;

a slot (7, 28) safe against ignition punch furnished between the wall parts (5,6,21, 22, 48, 55) and the profile clamp (4,29, 46, 53); wherein a corner region of the profile clamp is formed polygonal and exhibits at least two ignition punch safe profile slots (43).

22. (amended) The electrical device according to claim [1] 3, wherein the profile clamp (4,29, 46, 53) with the base web (8,30) and the side webs (9,10,31, 32, 47, 54) are produced as a single piece of a uniform material.

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 23 continue to be in the case.

The Office Action refers to Election/Restrictions.

1. Claims 7,9 and 20 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 4.

The applicant observes the withdrawal expressed in the Office Action. The applicants do not completely understand the Saito reference applied in the Office Action. Hey have ordered a translation of the lengthy Saito

reference to be made into the German language in order to be able to provide instructions.

It is further believed that claim 1 will also be found allowable once consideration is given to the casing being of the ignition protection kind flame proof enclosure "d" and that a slot safe against ignition punch is required according to claim 1.

The Office Action refers to the Information Disclosure Statement

2. The listing of reference EN 50018 in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, the reference has not been considered.

The Office Action refers to the Specification.

3. The abstract of the disclosure stands objected to because in line 1, "And" should be --An--. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The care and attention given by the Examiner to the Abstract is appreciated. A revised Abstract will be submitted.

4. The disclosure stands objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 7, "BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWING" should be --BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Applicant is providing the correction kindly proposed in the Office Action.

The Office Action refers to Claim Objections

5. Claims 1,2,4,6,8,14 and 15 stand objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1, line 3, after "comprising" Insert ":",

In claim 2, line 3, before "C-shape" insert "a";

In claim 4, line 6, "the right angle" should be --a right angle--;

In claim 6, line 2, "web" should be --webs--:

In claim 6, line 4, "part" should be --parts--;

In claim 8, line 2, after "comprising" insert ":",

In claim 8, line 3, "an" should be --the--:

In claim 14, line 2, after "comprising" insert ":",

In claim 15, line 2, after "comprising" insert ":", and

In claim 15, line 3, "an" should be--the--.

Appropriate correction is required.

The claims have been corrected in accordance with the kind proposals of the examiner.

The Office action refers to Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112.

7. Claims 1-6,8,10-19 and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1, line 2, "the ignition protection kind flame proof enclosure "d"" is unclear since there is no description in the specification of what constitutes a "d" type enclosure. Further, if type "d" is an industry standard for enclosures it is also indefinite since industry standards can change overtime. The "d" standard should be taken out of the claim and, if desired, replaced by specifics of what constitutes the standard.

The undersigned is inquiring with the applicant to resolve this question.

In claim 1, line 7, "a profile clamp ... shape matching against the force of an explosion" is indefinite since the term "shape matching" it is not clearly explained in the applicant's disclosure.

Shape matching indicates that the shapes of two engaging parts are matching up in order to for example provide a hook-up or a connection.

In claim 1, line 10, "a slot safe against ignition punch" is indefinite since the term "ignition punch" is not clearly explained in the applicant's disclosure. This term appears throughout the claims.

Applicants are pointing to the specification on page 10, lines 2 and 3 where reference is made to "an ignition punch safe slot 7".

In claim 4, lines 5 and 6, the term "preferably" renders the claim indefinite since the limitations thereafter are optional. Therefore, since these limitations have not been positively claimed, they have not been examined on their merits.

Claim 4 is being amended to remove the objectionable language.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "the support face" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 6 is unclear, possibly due to grammatical errors. The examiner suggests formatting the claim to: the stop face of the side webs of the profile clamp, the support face of the casing parts, and the ignition punch safe supplemental slot are disposed parallel to the ignition punch safe slot.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the kind proposal in the Office Action and are now implementing the proposal.

In claim 13, line 5, the term "preferably" renders the claim indefinite since the limitations thereafter are optional. Therefore, since these limitations have not been positively claimed, they have not been examined on their merits.

The objectionable language has been removed from claim 13.

Claim 19 recites the limitation "the recesses" In line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner suggests changing the claim to be dependent on claim 18, and to insert "the" before "projections" In line 2. The claim has been examined as depending from claim 18. In claim 19, line 4, the term "preferably" renders the claim indefinite since the limitations thereafter are optional. Therefore, since these

limitations have not been positively claimed, they have not been examined on their merits.

Claim 19 is being amended along the lines kindly proposed by the Examiner.

Claim 22 recites the limitation "the base web" in line 2 and "the side webs" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner suggests changing the claim to be dependent on claim 3. The claim has been examined as depending from claim 3. The claims have been examined as best understood.

The proposal of the Office Action is gratefully acknowledged and implemented in the present amendment.

The Office Action refers to Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102.

Regarding claim 1, Saito discloses in Fig. 4, a device casing comprising: two casing parts 5 and 6 having wall parts Sa and 6a disposed toward each other; a profile clamp 1a, 1d connecting the casing parts; a slot between the wall parts (see Fig. 3).

Claim 1 requires that a casing of the ignition protection flame proof enclosure "d" is present. No such feature is part of the Saito reference.

Claim 1 further requires that "a slot (7, 28) safe against ignition punch is furnished. There is no indication that any slot in Figure 3 or any other figure of the Saito reference is safe against ignition punch.

The Office Action refers to Allowable Subject Matter.

10. Claims 11, 14-19 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this

Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the finding of allowable subject matter. Claims 11, 14, 17, 18 and 21 are being amended to be placed in independent form and to be fully allowable.

The Office action concludes that:

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Gates (US 5,959,839) and Nishino et al (US 5,299,094); Both show casing parts connected by clamps.

Applicants submit that the prior art made of record neither anticipates nor renders obvious the present invention.

Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner should not be able to find a certain element of Applicants' claims in a search of the state of the art and such element is deemed by the Examiner to be necessary for forming a basis for a rejection, then the Examiner is invited to inform the Applicants of such element in order to allow the Applicants to fully meet their disclosure requirement in view of innumerable and hypothetical possibilities of combining references to allege obviousness of individual claims. In particular, in view of different levels of familiarity of inventors with the information disclosure

requirements of the United States Patent and Trademark Office developed in recent years and apparently still developing, which disclosure requirements are believed to be unique in the world, any help and suggestions regarding possible problems seen by the Examiner are welcome.

All claims as presently submitted are deemed to be in form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Reinhold Barlian et al.

By: *Horst M. Kasper*
Horst M. Kasper, their attorney
13 Forest Drive, Warren, N.J. 07059
Tel.(908)757-2839 Tel.(908)668-5262
Reg.No. 28559; Docket No.: BAR207

(rep-/am